

respective blind holes in which they are disposed.

*Amended*  
~~Please amend claim 2 as follows:~~

~~Claim 2.~~ (Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein said fastening step includes forcing said members into said blind holes [which]; wherein, the width of each of said members are slightly larger than the diameter said holes thereby frictionally holding said members in place with respect to said sign.

~~Please amend claim 3 as follows:~~

~~Claim 3.~~ (Amended) The method of claim 2 wherein said fastening step includes forcing a respective one of said members in the shape of a sphere into each respective one of said blind holes to an extent greater than the radius of said respective sphere whereby less than half of each of said respective spheres extends from each one of said respective holes and the widest portion of said sphere is in contact with [the] interior walls forming each of said respective holes.

REMARKS

Applicant through his attorney gratefully acknowledges the courtesy of a personal interview that was extended by Patent Examiner Timothy Eley on March 17, 1993.

During the course of the aforementioned interview, the proposed amendments to claim 1 were presented for the purposes of discussion and comparison with the references of record in general, and in particular, with regard to the Zagler, et al. and French patents.

In particular, it was emphasized that while the specification did not specifically call for a "blind" hole; the drawings (e.g., Figs. 10, 11, and 14 through 16) clearly show this specific structural element and form a definite basis for the inclusion of that limitation in the claim language.

It was also stressed that none of the references of record taken either alone or in combination with one another either teaches or suggests the invention as set forth in amended claim 1.

16